

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE  
UNIVERSITY SENATE  
12/8/67

The University Senate met at 2:10 pm, Friday, December 8, 1967, sixth floor, Library, President Elliott presiding.

The following corrections to the minutes of the meeting of November 17, 1967, were proposed by Professor Park:

1. That the line reading "Professor Park moved that rules requiring a three quarter vote be waived, . . . ." be changed to read, "Professor Park moved that the rules requiring prior publication of Resolutions be waived, in accordance with Section 9(a) of the by-laws, . . . ."
2. That the line beginning "Professor Park apologized for not getting his report out earlier, and moved the adoption of the report and resolutions included," be changed to read, "Professor Park expressed his regret that the short time the committee was given in which to hold hearings and prepare a report prevented an earlier report, and moved the adoption of the resolution attached to the report."
3. That the word "he" in the line beginning "Professor Park replied . . . ." be changed to "the committee."
4. That the line beginning "Professor Lewis said," on page 3, be changed to read ". . . the Academic Freedom Committee Statement," instead of "the Parks Committee Statement."
5. That the paragraph beginning "Professor Allen withdrew . . . ." through the word "Approved," but not including the last line be moved from p. 4 to a position just prior to the paragraph beginning "Professor Willson stated . . . ." on p. 3.
6. That the language of the paragraph beginning "Professor Willson stated . . . ." be changed to read as follows: "Professor Park moved the adoption of Resolution #2 on page 3 of the Committee report, seconded. Professor Willson stated . . . ." continuing then as it appears on page 3.
7. That the following line be added after the sentence "Professor Brewer then moved the question of the Willson amendment, and it carried." on page 4, "Resolution #2, as amended, was then voted upon and carried."

Professor Zuchelli proposed the modification of the minutes on page 4 so that the phrase,

"Professor Zuchelli moved to strike line 9, page 5"

will read,

"Professor Zuchelli moved to revise line 9, page 5."

Professor Wood moved the adoption of the corrections, Professor Stromsen seconded, the motion was voted upon, and the minutes were approved with the aforesaid corrections.

Professor Wood read A RESOLUTION IN HONOR OF THE MEMORY OF CHARLES S. WISE, who died November 23, 1967. The Resolution was unanimously approved as the Senate expressed its respect by standing for a moment of silence.

Professor Wood announced that Professor David E. Seidelson had been elected to the Senate by the Law School to replace Professor David J. Sharpe, who will be on a leave of absence during 1968.

Professor Wood moved to go into the committee of the whole in order to permit informality in the following period.

President Elliott then welcomed two guests of the Senate, Mr. E. K. Morris, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the University, and Professor Malcolm C. Henderson, Chairman of the Assembly of Ordinary Professors of the Catholic University of America.

In introducing Professor Henderson, President Elliott stated that it was timely and mutually beneficial to have an exchange between bodies of our respective universities as represented by the Assembly and the Senate.

Professor Henderson began his brief, but interesting talk by pointing out some of the differences between the two organizations - The Catholic University Assembly, and The George Washington University Senate. He stated that membership in the Assembly is limited at present to the ordinary (full) professors of the ten schools of the University. Other ranks of the faculty are not members of the Assembly, although there have been more special meetings with all ranks present and voting than ordinary ones.

Professor Henderson traced the background of the Assembly from its inception to the present. He said that he and a group of his colleagues met during the early months of this year, with the purpose of organizing such a body, as they believed there was a "need for communication and dialogue among the professors of the different schools of this University." As its first Chairman, Professor Henderson said he called immediately for a Secretary, for the "minutes of this body will be second only to the minutes of the Board of Trustees."

He said the University was in a "state of ferment," and that there had been four significant events: (1) The Board of Trustees had accepted three faculty representatives for attendance at Board meetings, with a "voice but no vote." (2) The Board of Trustees had accepted the modification of the Senate to make it more representative. (3) A change in statutes had been proposed that the Rector of the University may be a layman, and not have to be a priest. (4) There had been an incredible improvement in morale since Acting Rector Whelan had been in office.

Professor Henderson stated that the Assembly's Committee on University Government was now a standing committee, with the function of making suggestions to the Board of Trustees, rather than waiting for the Board to make suggestions to the committee.

President Elliott rose to thank Professor Henderson for his remarks, and announced that Professor Henderson would entertain questions from the members of the Senate. A short period of questions and answers followed.

The Senate than reconvened, and Professor Hill moved the adoption of A RESOLUTION TO PERMIT STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN DECISIONS OF ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE AND SUSPENSION (67/6):

That the President of the Student Body, with the advice and consent of the respective Dean's Councils, appoint one student, having the status of junior or above with a minimum QPI of 3.0, to become a full participant with voting privileges in the deliberations of each of the Dean's Councils of the University in each case where a student charged with academic dishonesty elects to have student participation in the judgment of his case. Students will be informed of their right to have such student participation in the letter of announcement of the meeting.

That the President of the Student Body, with the advice and consent of the respective Dean's Councils and/or Committees on Scholarship, appoint one student, having the status of junior or above with a minimum QPI of 3.0, to become a full participant with voting privileges in the deliberations of these Councils and/or Committees in each case where a student who has been suspended for academic deficiency and has appealed the ruling on suspension elects to have student participation in the judgment of his appeal. Students will be informed of their right to appeal and to have such student participation in the letter of announcement of the meeting.

In lieu of a written report from the committee on Student Relationships, Professor Hill spoke of the committee's reasoning on the Resolution. He said that it was important, from the student's viewpoint, to be represented. A student representative would, in effect, be a counsel, and under this Resolution the student would be assured of a student viewpoint. He also said there might be extenuating or aggravating circumstances known only to the students, and not known to the faculty.

Professor Park seconded the motion, and discussion followed, with statements to the question by Professors Lewis, Brewer, Herber, Wood, Allen, Willson, Heller and Sharpe.

Professor Brewer moved the two paragraph Resolution be separated and voted upon as two Resolutions. Professor Willson seconded, the question was called and the motion was passed.

Professor Hill then moved the submission of the first paragraph of the Resolution for action. Professor Park seconded, and the vote was called. The Resolution passed with no opposition.

Professor Hill moved the introduction of the second paragraph of the Resolution, it was duly seconded, discussion followed, with remarks to the question by Professors Sharpe and Heller. Professor Willson called the question, the vote was taken, with 9 ayes, 13 nay's, and the motion was lost.

Professor Hill rose to speak to A RESOLUTION TO ALTER THE PRESENT PENALTY FOR ACADEMIC DISHONESTY (67/5), and moved its introduction with the

following change in wording:

After the word "period" in the Resolution, add "at the end of which time he may petition for readmission."

The Resolution to read as follows:

That the penalty for academic dishonesty (page 34 of the current catalog) be amended to read as follows:

"Academic dishonesty on the part of any student will result in a disciplinary grade of F for the course involved and also may, upon the recommendation of the appropriate dean's council, result in his suspension from the University for a stated period at the end of which time he may petition for readmission. The disciplinary grade of "Failure--Academic Dishonesty" will be recorded for the course involved, and this grade will be employed in the computation of the quality point index. A student so suspended shall be withdrawn from all other courses except those in which all work has been completed."

Professor Reesing seconded the motion, discussion to the question followed. Dean Linton questioned the effectiveness of the proposed recording of "Failure-Academic Dishonesty." He observed that upon petition, the faculty of the Columbian College had occasionally authorized expunging such designations from the records of students within about a year after the penalty had been imposed. The question was called and the motion was passed.

Professor Hill read to the Senate a draft Resolution adopted by the University Committee on Student Life, December 8, 1967 - A RESOLUTION ON THE PROTECTION OF THE RIGHTS OF STUDENTS.

Professor Sharpe moved a ten minute recess, Professor Willson seconded, and the motion to recess was passed.

The meeting reconvened at 3:55 pm. Professor Park moved a waiver of the rules as provided in the by-laws, Section 9(a), in order that a RESOLUTION ON THE PROTECTION OF THE RIGHTS OF STUDENTS, which had been drafted by Professor Park, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom, might be submitted to the Senate. Quoted below are excerpts from a memorandum from Professor Park to the members of the Senate, dated December 8, 1967, concerning this Resolution:

"On December 5, 1967, the Student Council passed a motion invoking principles of academic freedom:

'That the Student Council recommend to the Administration that until General Hershey's directive to draft boards to classify protestors as I-A is revoked, the University ought not to allow military or naval recruiters on campus, in order to protect those students who wish to protest said recruiters.'

"At approximately 4 pm yesterday, I was asked to provide the Senate today with a Resolution responsive to the motion just cited.

". . .it was impossible for me to then meet 3 hours of class, prepare the Resolution, meet inescapable academic duties, have this report duplicated by 2 pm, today, and consult with the membership of this Committee.

"The attached Resolutions, therefore, do not come to the Senate with either the knowledge or approval of the Committee, but are offered by the Chairman at the request of the Senate Executive Committee. The choice of language and arguments offered, however, is my own and not that of the Executive Committee."

Professor Hill seconded the motion for a waiver of the rules, the question was called. In the vote that followed - 9 ayes, 12 nay's, the motion was lost.

Professor Sharpe then moved a special meeting of the Senate be called by the President, on Tuesday, December 12, 1967, in order for the Resolution to be submitted by the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom. Professor Hill seconded, and discussion followed.

Professor Allen directed a question to the chair: "In light of the substantial risk to our students by General Hershey's directive to the draft boards, can we wait until next Tuesday to take action on this Resolution?" He stated that in the ~~interim~~ protests may take place and George Washington University students may be in danger of reclassification. He asked whether any recruiting on campus was planned.

President Elliott recognized Mr. Robin Kaye, President of the Student Council, who replied that "there will be recruiting going on next week, and at least one is bound to be militarily related. I do not know whether there will be student protests."

President Elliott then recognized Mr. Smith, Director of Student Services, who stated there was to be no recruiting going on on campus Monday, however, there would be military recruiting on campus Tuesday by the Army Materiel Command.

President Elliott then stated "As a matter of information, The American Council on Education, representing approximately 1500 colleges, took action this morning to ask the White House to rescind General Hershey's letter. I strongly suspect the action of such a body as that is something the White House will not ignore. Any position taken by this Senate after a White House response would be too late for maximum impact. It remains for us to decide whether we can act today or whether we must postpone action until next Tuesday at the earliest."

After further discussion to the question by Professors Zuchelli, Allen, Sharpe, and Alpert, the question was called. The result was 6 ayes, and 13 nay's, and the motion for a special meeting was lost.

Professor Park moved, seconded by Professor Allen, a waiver of the rules to permit submission of the Resolution drafted by the University's Student Life Committee, which was read to the Senate by Professor Hill prior to the called recess. The question was called. The vote was 15 ayes and 3 nay's,



and the motion to waive the rules was passed.

In presenting the draft Resolution, Professor Hill stated that he had been asked by the Student Life Committee members to convey to the Senate the fact that this Resolution was in no way a commentary on the present war in Vietnam, or on the present draft laws, but to prevent an inroad on the University's stated policy of academic freedom. Professor Hill moved the adoption of the Resolution, Professor Park seconded, with amendments to the last paragraph as suggested by Professor Heller:

"The University Committee on Student Life" to read: "The University Senate," and after the word "dissent" be added "on University owned property."

Discussion to the question followed by Professors Heller, Alpert, Allen, Zuchelli, Brewer, Stromsen, Kramer, Sharpe, and St. Cyr. Professor Alpert moved a substitute Resolution:

"To request of General Hershey's office and the White House clarification and elucidation of General Hershey's letter as it affects the students of The George Washington University."

Professor St. Cyr seconded, the question was called, 3 ayes were heard, the majority voted nay, and the motion for a substitute Resolution was lost.

Professor Heller called the previous question, and the RESOLUTION ON THE PROTECTION OF THE RIGHTS OF STUDENTS (67/7), drafted by the University's Student Life Committee, with amendments proposed by Professor Heller, passed, with 13 ayes to 5 nay's, as set out below:

Whereas the recruiting activities of business and government organizations on the campus of the George Washington University gain legitimacy as a service to students, and

Whereas the University has explicitly affirmed the right of students to dissent and has officially accepted orderly protest against recruiters as a legitimate expression of dissent, and

Whereas the University has carefully defined the permissible limits to which students may proceed in protesting the presence of recruiters and has adopted procedures for implementing its policies designed to safeguard the rights of all, and

Whereas Lt. General Lewis B. Hershey, in a letter to "All Members of the Selective Service System" made public on November 8, 1967, has threatened punitive induction of those otherwise draft-deferred students who by some ill-defined "illegal demonstrations" may interfere with military recruiting, and


Whereas, in view of the intimidating effect of General Hershey's imprecise terminology, the presence of military recruiters on campus is inconsistent with the freedom of expression which the University has committed itself to protect,

therefore

The University Senate concludes that military recruiting can not presently be justified as a service to students and recommends to the President that until such time as the instructions to the Selective Service System contained in General Hershey's letter of November 8, 1967, have been rescinded, overruled, or clarified sufficiently to insure that the students' right to dissent on University owned property is not endangered, The George Washington University follow the recommendation of the Student Council that all recruiting by military services on this campus be suspended.

Finally, the meeting was opened for brief statements by members of the Senate, members of the Faculty Assembly in attendance and invited guests. Professor Brewer questioned the propriety of published expressions of the recommendations by committees of the Senate before these recommendations have been submitted to the Senate. He suggested that it would be well for the Executive Committee to set up "ground rules" relative to this matter. Other topics were touched upon by Professors Gray, Hill, Lewis, Park, Schlagel and Wood.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 pm.

  
Frederick R. Houser  
Secretary

December 8, 1967

Draft Resolution for the University Committee on Student Life:

Whereas the recruiting activities of business and government organizations on the campus of the George Washington University gain legitimacy as a service to students, and

Whereas the University has explicitly affirmed the right of students to dissent and has officially accepted orderly protest against recruiters as a legitimate expression of dissent, and

Whereas the University has carefully defined the permissible limits to which students may proceed in protesting the presence of recruiters and has adopted procedures for implementing its policies designed to safeguard the rights of all, and

Whereas Lt. General <sup>made public on</sup> Lewis B. Hershey, in a letter to "All Members of the Selective Service System" dated November 8, 1967, has threatened punitive induction of those otherwise draft-deferred students who by some ill-defined "illegal demonstrations" may interfere with military recruiting, and

Whereas, in view of the intimidating effect of General Hershey's imprecise terminology, the presence of military recruiters on campus is inconsistent with the freedom of expression which the University has committed itself to protect, therefore

The University Committee on Student Life concludes that military recruiting can not presently be justified as a service to students and recommends to the President that until such time as the instructions to the Selective Service System contained in General Hershey's letter of November 8, 1967, have been rescinded, overruled, or clarified sufficiently to insure that the student right to dissent is not endangered, The George Washington University follow the recommendation of the Student Council that all recruiting by military services ~~services~~ on this campus be suspended.

Unanimously adopted  
by Student Life Committee  
at 1:45 p.m.  
Dec. 8, 1967



*file*

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
Washington, D. C.

December 7, 1967

Memorandum To:       Members of the University Senate

From:                Reuben E. Wood, Chairman of the Executive Committee

The Student Council of the University has reported that the following motion was passed at its meeting of December 5, 1967:

That the Student Council recommend to the Administration that until General Hershey's directive to draft boards to classify protestors as I-A is revoked, the University ought not to allow military or naval recruiters on campus, in order to protect those students who wish to protest said recruiters.

President Elliott has requested that the University Senate consider this recommendation in the light of any action that the University Committee on Student Life may take relative to it, and that the Senate advise him in this matter.

REW:k